

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Contrina Lacretrica Bell,

Plaintiff,

v.

South Carolina State Housing Finance and  
Development Authority, a/k/a SC Housing  
Authority,

Defendant.

C/A No. 3:24-cv-6493-SAL

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Contrina Lacretrica Bell, proceeding pro se, filed this action alleging claims against the South Carolina State Housing Finance and Development Authority a/k/a SC Housing Authority (“Defendant”). This matter is before the court on the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), recommending the action be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process because it is frivolous and because there is no private right of action under several of the authorities Plaintiff relies upon and because she has otherwise failed to allege facts sufficient to state a claim. [ECF No. 7.] Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if she failed to do so. *Id.* at 11. Plaintiff has not filed objections, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>1</sup>

---


<sup>1</sup> When Plaintiff originally filed her complaint, she did not provide a mailing address, so the court requested Plaintiff’s mailing address over the phone and mailed the Report to Plaintiff at the address she provided. The court also sent Plaintiff a notice of change of address form, which Plaintiff completed and was received the day after the Report was mailed. The address on the change of address form is the same address to which the court mailed the Report.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After reviewing the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standards, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, ECF No. 7, and incorporates it by reference herein. This case is **SUMMARILY DISMISSED without prejudice.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

December 27, 2024  
Columbia, South Carolina

  
Sherri A. Lydon  
United States District Judge